



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,923	/851,923 05/09/2001		Julian S. Taylor	SMQ-117/P6141	3713
959	7590	02/24/2005		EXAMINER	
		FIELD, LLP.	NAHAR, QAMRUN		
28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2124	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/851,923	TAYLOR, JULIAN S.
Examiner	Art Unit
Qamrun Nahar	2124

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 10 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application,
applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a
Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following
time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have
been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37
CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal
was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of
Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of
Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling
the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-58</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary
and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. M The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
applicant's arguments are not persuasive. For example, in the remarks/arguments, the applicant argues that "Bartoletti only
discusses information collection of the operating system and its architecture, whereas the claimed invention collects
information on determined installed components, which may include both installed hardware and software components. In the
detailed description of the Applicant's application, installed hardware and software components are used to mean any one of
installed software packages, aplied patches, firmware revisions, and any other software and/or hardware resources
configuration on the host, and not just the operating system and its architecture." Examiner's Response: Bartoletti teaches collecting information on operating system, version, and architecture, which includes information on installed software and
hardware components. That is, Bartoletti teaches the claimed limitation "determining at least one of installed hardware and
software components on the computer". Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show
certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., installed software
packages, applied patches, firmware revisions, and any other software and/or hardware resources configuration on the host)
are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the
specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
13. Other:

Continuation	Sheet	PTOL	-3031

Application No.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 9-04)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20050209

Vaux

KAKALI CHAKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100